



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XXIII. It would not be very surprising if a Council held at Rome should have held the sanction of the Bishop of Rome necessary, especially where the circumstances of the Council of Ariminum are known. The Council of Ariminum, in Umbria, was convened by the Arian Emperor, Constantius, in 359, after he had banished Liberius, Bishop of Rome, because he would not concur in the excommunication of Athanasius. After two years exile at Berea, in Thrace, Liberius, no doubt, consented to sign the Arian creed; but after the death of Constantius in 361, and Liberius in 366, the cause of Arianism languished in the West, and it is not surprising that the Council at Rome under Damasus, in 369, refused to abide by the Arian Council of Ariminum. The passage, however, from the Roman Council in 369, does not refer solely to the want of the sanction of the Roman Bishop, but also to the want of consent of *Vicentius* and others also; which deprives the argument of any force whatever.

XXIV. Nothing can be more delusive than fixing upon an isolated expression in a long letter, and ignoring the rest. So far from this synodical letter being addressed by the Bishops of Constantinople to Damasus, as by sons to a father, it all through assumes the tone and style of equality. It was addressed, as Theodoret (in loco citato) tells us, "To our most honoured lords and most reverend brethren and fellow ministers, Damasus, Ambrose, Brittonius, Valerian, &c.," (not to "our holy father Pope Damasus," as Dr. Geraghty would insinuate). The passage from which Dr. G. quotes these words runs thus: "You have manifested to us your brotherly love, as is signified in the letters of your most pious Emperor, by inviting us to attend, as if domestic members," at the Council which you intend, according to the will of God, to hold in Rome, in order that, as we alone had to struggle with affliction, you may not reign alone, now that the Emperors are of one accord in religion; but that, to use the expression of the Apostle, we may reign with you."

The close of this epistle is a remarkable one, and shows how little idea these Bishops had of considering Rome as the mother and mistress of all Churches. "We must apprise you that the revered and pious Cyril is Bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, which is the mother of all Churches; that he was ordained according to law by the Bishops of the province, and that he has in various places withstood the Arians. We beseech you to rejoice with us that these Bishops have been ordained in a manner so strictly in accordance with the canon, and we entreat you to be united, to them by spiritual love and by the fear of the Lord, which represses human passions, and which causes us to attach more importance to the edification of the Church than to the love or sympathy of any creature. When we have come to one mind respecting the doctrines of faith, and when Christian love is established between us, we shall cease from saying what the Apostle condemns, 'I am of Paul. I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas.' We shall all be of Christ, who will not be divided in us; but, by God's help, we shall preserve the oneness of the body of the Church, and shall stand with confidence before the tribunal of the Lord."

XXV. How Dr. G. could have ventured to refer to Theodoret, lib. v., c. 23, as proving that Damasus showed his supremacy in deposing Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, is really surprising; and shows not only that he takes his statements at second hand, but from writers of either great ignorance or great carelessness. Theodoret, indeed, gives an account of the dispute between Flavian, Bishop of Antioch, and the Bishops of the west concerning Paulinus, A.D. 381; but there is nothing in it giving the least colour to the above assertion. Theodoret tells us "that the Romans and the Egyptians endeavoured to prejudice the Emperor against Flavian. Wearied by their importunity, the Emperor at length sent to Constantinople to summon Flavian to Rome. Flavian excused himself on account of its being winter, and promised to obey the Emperor's command the ensuing spring. He then returned to his native country. The Bishops of Rome, among whom was not only the admirable Damasus, but also Siricius, who afterwards succeeded him, as well as Anastasius, the successor of Siricius, rebuked the pious Emperor, and told him, that while he expressed the attempts of those who rose up against his own authority, he suffered those who insulted the laws of Christ to exercise the authority which they had usurped. The Emperor, therefore, sent again to compel Flavian to repair to Rome. To this mandate the wise Bishop replied, with great boldness of speech, saying—"If any individuals, oh Emperor, should accuse me of herodoxy, or should say that my life is derogatory to the episcopal dignity, I would permit my accusers to be my judges, and would submit to whatever sentence they might pronounce. But if it be only as to my right to my episcopal chair and office that they are contending, I shall not contend for any claims, but shall relinquish my seat to whoever may be appointed to take it. Give, then, oh Emperor, the bishopric of Antioch to whomsoever you please." The Emperor admired his courage and wisdom, and sent to command him to resume the government of his Church. Some time after the

Emperor returned to Rome, and the Bishops again reproached him for not having suppressed the tyranny of Flavian. The Emperor replied by asking what species of tyranny had been exercised by Flavian, and declared his readiness to prohibit it. The Bishops replying that they would not litigate any point against an emperor, he exhorted them to be reconciled with each other, and to terminate the foolish contention; for Paulinus had died long previously, and Evagrius had been illegally ordained. Besides, the Eastern Churches acknowledged the supremacy of Flavian; all the Churches of Asia, of Pontus, and of Thrace were united with him in communion; and all the Churches of Illyria looked upon him as the Primate of the East. The Bishops of the West were convinced by these representations, and promised to lay aside their hostility, and to receive an embassy from Flavian. Flavian therefore, sent Acacius Bishop of Berea, and others to Rome. On his arrival with the others at Rome he terminated his lengthened hostility of seventeen years and restored peace to the Church."—Lib. v. c. 23.

This is Theodoret's account, and as unlike, as it is well possible, an assertion that Damasus exercised or claimed any such power as that of deposing a Patriarch of Constantinople; and yet Dr. Geraghty coolly asserts that "this Pope (Damasus) further showed his supremacy in deposing Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople," and cites Theodoret, lib. v., c. 23, as his sole authority for the assertion.

PETER'S INHERITANCE AND PETER'S CHAIR. TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR,—All lovers of truth and courtesy must congratulate you on the result of your discussion with Dr. Geraghty; for in both you have proved *facile princeps*. You have, indeed, so confounded the learned Dr. by the sheer force of truth, that he quite forgets he has an infallible Church to guide him, and wanders into the region of probability, with only his own private judgment to enlighten him. He declares that (after all his dogmatism) it is a matter of opinion among Roman Catholics what the true foundation of the Church is: it may be Peter or his faith, or Christ, or all three may be involved in it, which last, in Dr. Geraghty's judgment, is most likely, so that it is only a weighing of probabilities as to which is the true foundation in the Church of Rome; and Dr. Geraghty's private judgment it is that decides for him which is the most likely hypothesis. Verily, but for the name, he might as well be without an infallible Church, if that is all the certainty he can have on so vital a point, and we surely may be allowed the use of our private judgment also, and it ought not to offend such a consistent reasoner as Dr. Geraghty, if we say that we think Christ is the most likely foundation for the Church He has purchased with His own blood.

But the reason I intrude upon you, sir, is, not that I can add anything to the complete answer you have given to all Dr. G.'s arguments, but to seek for information which, perhaps, Dr. G. may be able to give. I want to know what the modern Church of Rome has to do with the statement of St. Cyprian, that "they have not Peter's inheritance who have not Peter's chair?" Dr. G. seems to think that this settles the question for him; but as it seems to me to be the strongest statement that can be made adverse to Romanism, and favourable to the principles of the Reformation, I am quite at a loss to discover the grounds of Dr. G.'s exultation. He does not, I presume, take chair literally—he does not mean by it that article of furniture so called at Rome, which recent investigation has discovered to be the inheritance of Mahomet rather than of Peter.

"Peter's chair" must mean the same as "Moses' seat" (Mat. xxiii. 2). The Scribes are said to "sit in Moses' seat" because they taught men to "observe and do" what Moses commanded. And so men are said to have "chairs" of different sciences in our universities who teach the sciences of their respective chairs.

To have Peter's chair must have the same meaning—they have "Peter's chair" who teach Peter's doctrine. I ask, then, has the Church of Rome Peter's chair? Does she teach Peter's doctrines? If Dr. G. can prove she does, there would be no further controversy on the point; we would bow at once to Peter's chair, or we should, indeed, forfeit Peter's inheritance; for to Peter, I believe, was given the high and blessed office of preaching the Gospel of Christ, and making known the terms of salvation. He was the first confessor of the truth that saves the soul—the first living stone of the Church Christ was going to build—the first *πῆρα* of the *πέτρα*. That was the foundation on which none other was or could be laid—Christ Jesus (1 Cor. iii. 11), and he was rewarded for his precedence in the confession of that true faith by being made the first preacher of it—to him the glorious commission was given. "I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Mat. xvi. 19). And did not Peter fulfil this commission, when, by preaching the Gospel of Christ, he opened the kingdom of heaven to the Jews, first on the day of Pentecost, when 3,000 souls were made the heirs of the kingdom of heaven, and also to the Gentiles, when he was sent for this special purpose to Cornelius (Acts x. 2)?

Did he not then, too, do what Christ gave him power and authority to do? Did he not loose the Jews from the yoke that neither they nor their fathers were able to bear, that burdensome law of commandments contained in ordinances, from which none could loose them save one commissioned from heaven, as Peter was? And did he not loose the Gentiles too, from their hopeless superstitions, from their exclusion from God's grace and covenant, and open for them the kingdom of God's elect Church, from which they had hitherto been aliens? (Eph. ii. 12, 22.) Thus did Peter fulfil his Lord's commission and loose both Jews and Gentiles from their respective bondage; and what he has loosed has been loosed in heaven, as all the Apostles testify. He was commissioned to bind, too; and so we find him binding those he loosed: he bound them to the easy and light yoke of Christ. He bound them to the truth that "there is no other name under heaven from among men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv., 11, 12). He bound men thus to believe and obey the Gospel; he loosed them from the bondage of Jewish ceremonial and bigotry, and pagan superstition, that he might bind them to the faith and service of Christ. This was Peter's office—Peter's chair—to make known to the slaves of ignorance, and vice, and carnal ordinances the grace and truth of Jesus, and the liberty wherewith He hath made us free. This he himself declared to be the chair to which God had appointed him (Acts xv., 7-11). Has Rome this chair? Does she use Peter's keys? Does she preach that only name given under heaven that can save the soul, and set at liberty them that are bound? Does she bind them heart and soul to the service of Christ and His righteousness? (Rom. vi., 17, 18.) Alas, no. She reverses the acts of Peter: she takes away his keys from men (Comp. Luke xi., 52). She rescinds his decrees, given in solemn council of the Church, which bound Apostles (Acts xv., 14), and should bind us. She binds again the yoke of Jewish ordinances and pagan superstitions, and makes of the twain her new system, from which Peter "loosed" men, and which has been "loosed in heaven." And she looses them from the single faith working by love, which Peter bound upon all that will be saved, and which has been bound in heaven.

And she it is that boasts of Peter's chair! As well may Mahomedanism boast that it is the chair of Asia's Seven Churches. The Churches of England and Ireland have established here the chair of Peter; they teach his doctrines; they repeat his protest (Acts xv. 10) against a yoke from which Christ, by the mouth of Peter, has set us free, and which Rome re-binds. We thank God, therefore, we have Peter's inheritance; we have the glorious liberty of the children of God, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, which faith in the Son of God secures to us. This seems to me so evident that I am at a loss to know what claim Dr. G. can make to Peter's chair or Peter's inheritance. Let him but prove his claim; let him but point us to the inheritance of Peter's teaching, and we submit. Let but the Pope send his encyclical letter to all bishops and priests of his communion to preach the doctrine Peter preached, to loose men from the yoke Peter loosed us from, and to bind only on men's consciences the one thing needful that Peter bound, and he will exterminate all Protestants. Let him teach even what the Popes of Cyprian's time taught, and we will pay him the deference Cyprian did; though we will reserve to ourselves the liberty St. Cyprian resigned not—of protesting against anything he may propound that may be contrary to the chair of Peter.

I am, dear sir, faithfully yours, C. J. M.

SACRAMENTAL WAFERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—On reading in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for August, "Practices of the Ancient Church," I find an inaccuracy at page 88, which I am sure the writer of that article will excuse me for pointing out to him. The "little round wafers," the sacramental bread, he says, "they (the priests) never break them for distribution." This is incorrect, I know to the contrary, having seen the consecrated wafers broken, and distributed to persons communicating. This is likely to occur frequently in large and populous towns, especially during the "Easter indulgence," when every Roman Catholic is expected, as he is commanded, to present himself at the communion table under pain of mortal sin. In numerous congregations it is impossible for the priest to calculate on the number of communicants that may present themselves at his mass, and although he may have consecrated an extra number of wafers, expecting a large number of communicants, still they may fall short of the number required, in that case, the priest seeing that the "hosts" are likely to fall short, he breaks them and distributes them in halves or smaller portions, and so distributes them; where this is not done, the communicants, in case of a deficiency of "hosts," would be deprived of the sacrament, and obliged to present themselves on another occasion. The priest himself, when he communicates at his mass, breaks the consecrated bread before putting it into his mouth.—Your obedient servant, T. E.

[We feel obliged to our correspondent for the correction of an unconscious inaccuracy, though it is in a matter of no moment to our argument. The ordinary practice is as we stated.]

¹ The words are, "Neque enim prejudicium agere nesci potuit ex numero eorum, qui apud Ariminum conveniunt; cum constat, neque Romanum Episcopum cuius ante omnes ita expetenda sententia, neque Vicentium, qui tot annos sacerdotum infidelitate servavit, neque alios hujusmodi statutis concessum aliquem emendasse."

² Theodoret, Paris ed., 1642, p. 715, (ὡς κῆρα μέλη).